IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA WESTERN DIVISION

NO. 5:22-CV-331-FL

JONATHAN BERALL, M.D., M.P.H.,)
Plaintiff,)
v.)
TELEFLEX MEDICAL INCORPORATED,	ORDER
Defendant.)
)
	,)

This matter is before the court on the parties' joint motion to set upcoming deadlines in this case. After reviewing the parties' separate proposals, the court sets the following schedule in accordance with the Local Patent Rules. Any deadlines set in previous case management orders not altered herein remain in effect.

Deadline	Date
Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Preliminary Infringement Contentions	June 27, 2023
Disclosure of Preliminary Invalidity Contentions	August 11, 2023
Close of Fact Discovery	60 days after entry of an order on claim construction
Expert Reports On Issues On Which Each Party Bears Burden Of Proof	90 days after entry of an order on claim construction
Expert Reports On Issues On Which Opposing Party Bears Burden Of Proof	120 days after entry of an order on claim construction

Deadline	Date
Rebuttal Expert Witness Disclosures	134 days after entry of an order on claim construction
Close of Expert Discovery	164 days after entry of an order on claim construction
Dispositive and <u>Daubert</u> Motions ¹	185 days after entry if an order on claim construction
Responses to Dispositive and <u>Daubert</u> Motions	21 days after filing of dispositive and <u>Daubert</u> motions
Replies to Dispositive and <i>Daubert</i> Motions	14 days after filing of responses to dispositive and <u>Daubert</u> motions
Agreed Pretrial Order	7 days prior to final pretrial conference
Final Pretrial Conference	To be set by subsequent order
Trial	To be set by subsequent order

SO ORDERED, this the 23rd day of June, 2023.

LOUISE W. FLANAGAN
United States District Judge

-

Daubert motions are defined as motions to exclude testimony of expert witnesses pursuant to Federal Rules of Evidence 702, 703, or 705, <u>Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</u>, 509 U.S. 579 (1993), <u>Kumho Tire Co. v. Carmichael</u>, 526 U.S. 137 (1999), or similar case law.